

Evacuation proved an emotional disturbance, and the strength of family feeling was illustrated by the children's comments. Home-sickness caused nervous and moral upsets. Fear of the children's ill-treatment, jealousy of the foster-parents, and the parents' own psychological need made them

recall their children. Evacuation failed through lack of information about children and foster-parents, and because institutes could not replace the home. Future civilization depends on healthy family relationships.

D. ROBERTSON-RITCHIE.

CORRESPONDENCE

Estimates of Future Population

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I believe that it is intended that new estimates of the future population of England and Wales shall be made by the Population Investigation Committee. Certainly the estimates of future birth rates and population totals, for England and Wales, given in *The Future of our Population*, turned out to be very erroneous. Taking the figures from the second edition of this pamphlet, 1938, page 17, the probable average crude birth rate for the 5 years 1935-39 was given as 12.41; actually it was 15.1. Similarly, the probable average crude birth rate for the 5 years 1940-44 was given as 10.72; actually for the 3 years 1940-42 it was 14.9. The average error for the 8 years was 3.2. It is not possible to attribute these large differences between predicted and actual values to the effect of the war, because the discrepancies began in 1935.

The moral is, perhaps, obvious. We should be careful not to attach any great importance to predictions of future birth rates. General views of tendencies may properly be held; and there are certain statistical predictions, based on life-table expectations, which afford a reasonably sure ground for calculations, such as the number of survivors, in any given year, of the females born within a certain space of time. But the prediction, years in advance, of birth rates, is liable, as we have seen, to be misleading.

C. F. ARDEN-CLOSE.

Mayfield, 22 Christchurch Road,
Winchester.

"Birth, Poverty and Wealth"

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—We are all of us indebted to Mr. Titmuss for his valuable analysis of the variations in infantile mortality in his five economic classes. I do not think that his conclusions with regard to the

cause, a purely economic reason, will meet with quite the same acceptance. Firstly, an omnibus class "unskilled labour" is most unsatisfactory. Galton divided it into unskilled labour in constant employment and unskilled labour in casual employment and made it the dividing line in the community. The former comprise a most valuable section of the community; the latter comprise a most miscellaneous group, including members of the so-called "Social Problem Group." As intelligence is an important factor in this question, one certainly would expect to find more progress in the higher classes, especially in a transitional period when there is new knowledge to be assimilated.

And this brings me on to my second point. He is, through no fault of his own, rather in the position of a man describing a mile race in the middle of the third lap, when there is still a lap and a half to run. The infantile mortality rate only begun to fall in 1900; he gives us the position in 1911, 1921, and 1931. But since then we have had another enormous drop. We have lately been given a figure of 48—a fall of 20 per cent on the 1931 figure. Until this figure is analysed we cannot tell whether his phenomenon is not purely transitional.

But, thirdly, there is a genetic point on which he just touches in his Appendix C. There is a considerable correlation between the birth rate and infantile mortality figures. Those countries with a low birth rate have a low infantile mortality rate and vice versa. Which are the countries with the low birth rates? Those where the families are small. Now, as long ago as 1911, Dr. R. J. Ewart in the REVIEW pointed out that second children in a family had the lowest infantile mortality rate and that this rate rose steadily until the eleventh child and upward had a rate three times that of the second child. No doubt the figures have changed since then, but not the trend. Apply this to the five economic classes. The size of the family is certainly greater in the Vth and the Ist—so here is a factor tending to produce the phenomenon

which is purely genetic. I think this is a subject well worth detailed examination by Mr. Titmuss.

B. S. BRAMWELL.

London, N.W.3.

Deterrents to Parenthood

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Miss Joan Hope (EUGENICS REVIEW, July 1943, p. 47) is causing confusion by discussing "intelligent women" instead of the studious exam-passing female graduate referred to in Mr. Halford's letter.

It is true that the latter type too easily assumes that she alone is intelligent and that nurses and housewives are mere clods, but it is surprising that a State Registered Nurse should apparently concur in so arrogant and baseless a claim by using the term "intelligent woman" as synonymous with female graduate.

My own experience is that Mr. Halford is dead right in his views, which however are certain to be bitterly resented. The marriage and fertility rates of female graduates are there to support his contentions.

The hardships of the housewife are severe, as Mrs. Jenkins clearly shows (July 1943, p. 98), and they are not made lighter by Head Mistresses of elementary schools who advise only their worst pupils to do domestic work.

Nursery schools and crèches are very valuable, but not, as Mrs. Jenkins suggests, merely to encourage female graduates to marry and bear children. If that were their only value, they would not be worth while for two reasons. Firstly, these facilities would be futile, if (as Miss Joan Hope asserts) few intelligent men can be persuaded to marry female graduates. Secondly, the nursery schools and crèches would be insufficient. Domestic helps are essential if the homes of these graduates are not to become filthy and their husbands die of malnutrition while "they themselves continue the profession for which they have been trained."

P. D. H. CHAPMAN, M.B.

Town Hall,
Bridlington.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Miss Hope, perhaps unintentionally, in her criticisms of my arguments seems principally to rely upon what seems like question begging. With a more open mind and acquaintance with the psychology of sex she would know that the maternal may be powerfully present in a woman in whom the sexual instinct is entirely absent. That fact invalidates many superficial conclusions. If intelligent men too often prefer to marry unintelligent women is not that something that rebuts Miss Hope's claims?—intelligent men naturally prefer a woman who will be in the essential sense a wife, to one who is merely a housekeeper or lady

companion. Her admission that there may be more unhappy marriages amongst the intelligent largely concedes all that I claimed. Otherwise her objections strike one as rather juvenile. Mrs. Jenkins, unconsciously, also grants practically that I am right, for what I dealt with was the absence of the contribution of well-endowed children that we should expect from intelligent mothers, and by stating that "there are . . . good reasons" Mrs. Jenkins acknowledges the correctness of my contention.

It seems only just to say that she, too, appears to err into question-begging statements that are quite unworthy of so serious a subject as the future mental quality of the race. Some people would say that she looks at these questions from an almost entirely partisan standpoint.

My assertion that the student habit in women aborts the sexual instinct has been made by many scientific authorities of far more important position than mine. My attention was first drawn to it by my friend the late Dr. Bernard Hollander more than forty years ago.

S. H. HALFORD.

17 Bruce Grove,
Tottenham.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I must apologize if I have caused confusion by my reference to "intelligent women," but I had gathered from Mr. Halford's letter that the point at issue was the deplorably low birth rate among the intelligent, his suggested reason for this being that intelligent women were averse to marriage. If, as Dr. Chapman has suggested, Mr. Halford referred only to "exam-passing female graduates," I would now remind him that intelligence is inheritable: education is acquired. There are plenty of intelligent women who have chosen other than university careers. Conversely, not all graduates are necessarily of high intelligence, as at present entrants are selected mainly because their parents can afford to give them higher education, or at least help them towards this.

The disquieting fact remains that the marriage rate among intelligent women *in all walks of life* is low when compared with that among women of low-grade intelligence. The problem of the hardened (but intelligent) spinster is deeper than mere aversion to marriage. I am convinced that such women are born with normal human instincts and desires, which are in most cases apparent in early youth, but which for one reason or another become repressed. Perhaps this is due to the greater sensitivity of intelligent people, these women tending to build around themselves a wall of defence. But this is a matter to be dealt with by the psychologist.

JOAN HOPE, S.R.N.

Hammersmith Hospital,
W.12.